

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were presented for examination, and all claims were rejected. Claims 1-21 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 6, 14, 15 and 21 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 1-21 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

NON-STATUTORY OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1, 14, 15 and 21 were provisionally rejected under nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 15, 18, 22 and 32 of U.S. Patent No. 7,644,434 to Pollutro (“Pollutro 2”) in view of US Patent Publication No. 2003/0005118 to Williams (“Williams”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request that the Examiner holds this rejection in abeyance until allowable subject matter is found in the present application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101**I. Claims 21 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants hereby by amend claims 21 to direct the claims to a computer readable storage medium responsive to the Examiner’s comments. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to with the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**II. Claims 1-21 Are Rejected as Anticipated by Williams**

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Williams. Claims 1, 6, 14, 15 and 21 are independent. Claim 14 is hereby canceled mooted this rejection with respect to this claim. Claims 2-5 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 7-13 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 6. Claims 16-20 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 15. Applicants submit that Williams does not disclose each and every limitation of the claimed invention.

A. Independent Claim 1 Patentable over Williams

A claim is anticipated only if each and every limitation as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Claim 1 recites:

modifying a message to be transmitted during a session between a client and a server system to include a session identification flag and a session identifier corresponding to an originator of the session on the server system and allowing the originator of the session to be uniquely identified among originators of sessions on the server system;

transmitting the message between the client and the server system;

checking the transmitted message for the session identification flag; and

reading the session identifier of the transmitted message to determine the originator of the message.

Williams fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Williams fails to disclose a modifying a message to include a session identification flag and a session identifier corresponding to an originator of the session. The Examiner equates a service token of Williams having an embedded session identifier to both the session identification flag and session identifier corresponding to the originator. First, Williams modifies the message to only include one item: a token. Secondly, the token is not a session identification flag. At most, the token may include a session identifier – albeit one that may not correspond and be used to determine the originator of the message. Therefore, Williams fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because Williams does not disclose each and every element of independent claim 1, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-5 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2-5 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

B. Independent Claim 6 Patentable over Williams

A claim is anticipated only if each and every limitation as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Claim 6 recites:

appending a session identifier and a security tag to the communication packet, the session identifier uniquely identifying the client in the client/server system; authenticating the session identifier using the security tag; and

if the appended session identifier is authenticated, determining the originator of the transmitted communication packet based on the appended session identifier.

Williams fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Williams fails to disclose appending a session identifier and a security tag to the communication packet and authenticating the session identifier using the security tag. In the Office Action, the Examiner identifies a data field of Williams to be equated to the security tag and then further identifies the token of Williams to be the session identifier. However, the data field is not used to authenticate the session identifier in the token. Instead, the server authenticates the token by matching it to the session id. The server does not use one item of the message – a security tag – to authenticate a second item in the same message – the session identifier. Therefore, Williams fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because Williams does not disclose each and every element of independent claim 6, Applicants submit that claim 6 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 7-13 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 6. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 7-13 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 6-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

C. Independent Claim 15 Patentable over Williams

A claim is anticipated only if each and every limitation as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Claim 15 recites:

a server; and

a client operationally connected to the server, the client and server being configured to transmit one or more messages there between during a session, each of the messages to be transmitted being modified by one of the client or the server to include a session identification flag and a session identifier, the client and server being further configured such that:

the modified message is transmitted to the remaining one of the client and the server;
the session identification flag of the transmitted message is checked by the remaining one of the client and the server to validate the session identifier; and
if the session identifier is validated the session identifier of the transmitted message is read to determine the originator of the transmitted message, the session identifier corresponding to an originator of a session on the server system and allowing the originator of the session to be uniquely identified among originators of sessions on the server system.

Williams fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Williams fails to disclose checking the session identification flag of the transmitted message to validate the session identifier and if the session identifier is validated reading the session identifier to determine the originator of the transmitted message. Although Williams may describe tokens with an embedded session identifier, Williams does not describe using a flag of a transmitted message to validate the token or session identifier before reading the session identifier. Furthermore, Williams does not describe the same transmitted message with two parts: a session identifier flag and the session identifier, in which one part, the flag, is used to check the other part, the session identifier. Therefore, Williams fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because Williams does not disclose each and every element of independent claim 15, Applicants submit that claim 15 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 16-20 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 15. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 16-20 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

D. Independent Claim 21 Patentable over Williams

A claim is anticipated only if each and every limitation as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Claim 21 recites:

modifying a message to be transmitted during a session between the client and the server to include a session identification flag and a session identifier, the session identifier being assigned corresponding to the originator of the session on the server system and allowing the originator of the session to be uniquely identified among originators of sessions on the server system;

re-computing a control portion of the message to reflect the inclusion of the session identification flag and the session identifier;

transmitting the message between the client and the server;

checking the transmitted message for the session identification flag;

reading the session identifier of the transmitted message to determine the originator of the message;

removing the session identification flag and the session identifier from the transmitted message; and

re-computing the control portion of the message to reflect the removal of the session identification flag and the session identifier.

Williams fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Williams fails to disclose re-computing a control portion of the message to reflect the inclusion or removal of the session identification flag and the session identifier. As previously argued, Williams does not describe having both a session identification flag and session identifier in the same message. Furthermore, Williams does not describe a control portion of the message never mind re-computing the control portion based on changes to the message with respect to the session identification flag and session identifier. Therefore, Williams fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because Williams does not disclose each and every element of independent claim 21, Applicants submit that claim 21 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' representative would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP

Dated: November 23, 2010

/Christopher J. McKenna/

Christopher J. McKenna

Registration No. 53,302

Attorney for Applicant

Foley and Lardner LLP

111 Huntington Ave

Boston, MA 02199

(617) 342-4056 (phone)

(617) 342-4001 (fax)